

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-37, 39-42, 45-58, 67-69, and 71-73 are pending, of which claims 1-3, 6, 16, 26, 32, 35, 53, 67-68, and 71-73 have been amended.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

A. Claims 1, 5, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent Publication No. U.S. 2001/0004609 to Walker et al. (hereinafter "Walker '609") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,601,171 to Carter et al. (hereinafter "Carter"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,935,952 to Walker et al. (hereinafter "Walker '952") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

B. Claims 2-4, 6-44, 67-68, and 70-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Walker '609, Carter, and Walker '952, and further in view of Stallings (Cryptography and Network Security: Principles and Practice, Second Edition) (hereinafter "Stallings") and Carter (*Office Action* p.4). Claims 38, 43-44, 70, and 74 are canceled

C. Claims 45-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Walker '609 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,592,651 to Rackman (hereinafter "Rackman"), Stallings, and Carter (*Office Action* p.13).

Walker '609 describes a distributed electronic tournament system in which many remotely located players participate in a tournament through input/output devices connected to a central controller which manages the tournament. The

1 system uniquely identifies a player when communicating with the central
2 controller via an associated input/output device (Walker '609 *Abstract*).

3 Carter describes delegating rights in a distributed computer system from a
4 principal to one or more deputies that have identities separate from the principal.
5 This allows the deputies to persist after the principal logs off the system, and
6 permits deputization across boundaries imposed by namespaces and particular
7 network protocols (Carter *Abstract*).

8 Walker '952 describes a remote gaming system whereby a player can
9 gamble against a wagering establishment or state-run lottery from a remote
10 location via a personal computer where it is unnecessary to establish an on-line
11 connection with a host computer associated with the wagering establishment
12 (Walker '952 *Abstract*).

13
14 **Claim 1** recites a method comprising:

15 initiating an online gaming activity from a gaming console with
16 multiple users; and

17 authenticating the multiple users of the gaming console, the gaming
18 console, a game title, and an online service together in a single
19 request/reply exchange between an authentication entity and the gaming
20 console.

21 The Walker '609, Carter, and Walker '952 combination does not teach or
22 suggest “authenticating the multiple users of the gaming console, the gaming
23 console, the game title, and an online service in a single request/reply exchange
24 between an authentication entity and the gaming console”, as recited in claim 1.
25

1 The Office acknowledges that Walker '609 does not disclose authenticating
2 multiple users together in a single request/reply exchange, and that Walker '609
3 does not disclose authenticating the gaming system, a game title, and an online
4 service (*Office Action* p.3). Thus, the Office only relies on Walker '609 for the
5 authentication of users (*Office Action* p.3) – but not the authentication of multiple
6 users together, as recited in claim 1.

7 Walker '609 is directed to gaming by players who are remotely located
8 from each other (Walker '609 *Abstract*). Walker '609 describes that a central
9 controller can manage tournaments by uniquely identifying each individual player
10 as that player logs on, and by authenticating the input/output device associated
11 with the player. A unique identifier of an individual player allows other remote
12 players in a tournament to know whom they are playing against (Walker '609, p.2
13 ¶[0023]).

14 In addition to failing to teach or suggest authenticating multiple users of a
15 gaming console together in a single request/reply exchange between an
16 authentication entity and the gaming console, as recited in claim 1, Walker '609
17 also fails to teach or suggest that the multiple users (*i.e.*, the multiple users being
18 authenticated in the single reply/request exchange) are users of a gaming console
19 that is initiating an online gaming activity, as recited in claim 1. Walker '609 also
20 fails to teach or suggest authenticating a gaming console, a game title, and an
21 online service (along with the authenticating of the multiple users) in the same
22 request/reply exchange between an authentication entity and the gaming console,
23 as recited in claim 1.
24
25

1 The Office cites Carter for a system for delegation of multiple users in a
2 distributed system, except that Carter does not disclose authenticating a gaming
3 system, a game title, or an online service (*Office Action* p.3). The Office relies on
4 the Walker '609 and Carter combination for authenticating the multiple users of
5 the gaming console in a single request/reply exchange between an authentication
6 entity and the gaming console, as recited in claim 1. The Office attempts to
7 support this assertion by stating that Carter discloses "a system for delegation
8 (authentication) of multiple users in a distributed system" (*Office Action* p.3).

9 However, Carter fails to cure the deficiencies of Walker '609 for several
10 reasons and Applicant respectfully contends that Carter is not even applicable as a
11 reference. For example, Carter fails to teach or suggest authenticating multiple
12 users of a gaming console, and says nothing about a gaming console, a gaming
13 console having multiple users, or authenticating the multiple users of a gaming
14 console in a single request/reply exchange between an authentication entity and
15 the gaming console, as recited in 1.

16 Rather, Carter describes a single user of a distributed computing system
17 submitting a request to be authenticated so that the user can delegate rights to a
18 deputy (Carter *Abstract*). More specifically, if a user (200) wants to be
19 authenticated in order to delegate rights to a deputy, the user (200) first logs into
20 the system (100) by exchanging login information (204) with a server (206)
21 (Carter col.7, lns.40-44). The server (206) then sends an authentication request
22 (212) to a distributed deputization point (DDP) (202) which checks the
23 authentication request (212, and either recognizes or refuses the request (Carter
24 col.7, ln.66 to col.8, ln.2). If the authentication request is accepted as legitimate
25

1 by the DDP (202), it can then send an authentication response (214) to the
2 principal (206). This authentication response (214) indicates that the user (200) is
3 now authenticated so that the principal can delegate rights to one or more deputies
4 (Carter col.8, lns.5-25). In any case, the "deputies" of Carter are not multiple
5 users of a gaming console, and Carter says nothing about authenticating the
6 multiple users of a gaming console in a single request/reply exchange between an
7 authentication entity and the gaming console, as recited in 1.

8 Applicant submits that in addition to failing to teach or suggest
9 authenticating the gaming console, the game title, and the online service as the
10 Office recognizes, Carter also fails to teach or suggest that these are authenticated
11 along with the multiple users of a gaming console together in a single
12 request/reply exchange between an authentication entity and the gaming console,
13 as recited in claim 1.

14
15 The Office cites Walker '952 for authentication of a gaming console, a
16 game title, and an online service (*Office Action* p.3). However, Walker '952 fails
17 to cure the deficiencies of Walker '609 and/or Carter as described above. More
18 specifically, Walker '952 fails to teach or suggest authenticating multiple users of
19 a gaming console, the gaming console, the game title, and an online service in a
20 single request/reply exchange between an authentication entity and the gaming
21 console, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Walker '952 discloses a remote gaming
22 system whereby a player can gamble against a wagering establishment or state-run
23 lottery from a remote location via a personal computer (*Office Action* p.3,
24 Walker '952 *Abstract*).

1 Although Walker '952 describes making a remote gaming system more
2 secure, Walker '952 does not teach or suggest authenticating the multiple users of
3 a gaming console in a single request/reply exchange between an authentication
4 entity and the gaming console, as recited in claim 1. In addition, Walker '952 does
5 not teach or suggest authenticating the gaming console used by the multiple users,
6 the game title, and an online service (along with the multiple users of the gaming
7 console) in a single request/reply exchange between an authentication entity and
8 the gaming console, as recited in claim 1.

9 Applicant submits that Walker '609, Carter, and/or Walker '952 do not
10 teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1 for at least the reasons described
11 above. Accordingly, independent claim 1 along with dependent claim 5 is
12 allowable over the Walker '609, Carter, and Walker '952 combination, and
13 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

14
15 **Claim 69** recites “obtain authentication of multiple users of the game
16 console together in a single request/reply exchange with an authentication entity,
17 wherein the single request/reply exchange identifies the multiple users, the game
18 console, a game title, and an online service”. As described above in response to
19 the rejection of claim 1, Walker '609, Carter, and/or Walker '952 do not teach or
20 suggest a single request/reply exchange with an authentication entity to
21 authenticate multiple users of the game console, as recited in claim 69.

22 Accordingly, claim 69 is allowable over the Walker '609, Carter, and
23 Walker '952 combination, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103
24 rejection be withdrawn.
25

1
2 **Claims 2-4** are rejected over Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and further
3 in view of Stallings as described above. The Office cites to Stallings for an
4 example Kerberos environment (*Office Action* p.5), but Stallings does not remedy
5 the deficiencies of the Walker '609, Carter, and Walker '952 combination as
6 described above in response to the rejection of claim 1. The Walker '609, Carter,
7 and Walker '952 combination fails to teach or suggest authenticating the multiple
8 users of the gaming console, the gaming console, the game title, and the online
9 service in a single request/reply exchange between an authentication entity and the
10 gaming console, as recited in claim 1.

11 Although Stallings discusses authentication, the Stallings reference also
12 fails to disclose authenticating multiple users of a gaming console, the gaming
13 system, the game title, and the online service in a single request/reply exchange
14 between the authentication entity and the gaming console, as recited in claim 1.

15 Accordingly, claims 2-4 are allowable over the Walker '609, Carter,
16 Walker '952, and Stallings combination for at least these reasons, and the §103
17 rejection should be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 2-4 are allowable by virtue of
18 their dependency upon allowable independent claim 1.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 **Claim 6** recites a method comprising:

2 submitting a single request from a game console to a ticket issuing
3 entity, the request containing a game console identity, multiple user
4 identities identifying multiple users of the game console, and an identity of
 an online service;

5 returning a ticket from the ticket issuing entity to the game console,
6 the ticket containing the game console identity and the multiple user
 identities encrypted with a key associated with the online service;

7 passing the ticket from the game console to the online service; and

8 decrypting the ticket at the online service, wherein after the
9 decrypting the authenticity of the multiple users contained in the ticket is
10 trusted.

11 Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do not teach or suggest
12 all of the feature(s) recited in claim 6. As described above in response to the
13 rejections of claims 1 and 2, Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do
14 not describe “submitting a single request from a game console to a ticket issuing
15 entity, the request containing a game console identity, multiple user identities
16 identifying multiple users of the game console, and an identity of an online
17 service”, as recited in claim 6.

18 Accordingly, independent claim 6 along with dependent claims 7-15 are
19 allowable over the Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and Stallings combination,
20 and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

21
22 **Claim 16** recites a method comprising “creating, at a game console,
23 multiple validated user identities ... identifying multiple users of the game console
24 and composed of user identities ... and associated values ... derived from the
25

1 user's key", and "forming, at the game console, a request containing an identity
2 string that includes a game console identity X, a game title identity G, the multiple
3 validated user identities, and an identity A of an online service".

4 Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do not teach or suggest
5 all of the feature(s) recited in claim 16. As described above in response to the
6 rejections of claims 1 and 2, Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do
7 not describe multiple validated user identities identifying multiple users of the
8 game console and composed of user identities and associated values derived from
9 the user's key, and forming, at the game console, a request containing an identity
10 string that includes a game console identity, a game title identity, the multiple
11 validated user identities, and an identity of an online service, as recited in
12 claim 16.

13 Accordingly, independent claim 16 along with dependent claims 17-25 are
14 allowable over the Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and Stallings combination,
15 and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

16
17 **Claim 26** recites a method for operating a game console, comprising:

18 submitting a request to a ticket issuing entity, the request containing
19 multiple user identities identifying multiple users of the game console, a
20 game title, and an identity of an online service; and

21 receiving a single ticket from the ticket issuing entity that can be
22 used to authenticate the multiple user identities and the game title to the
23 online service.

24 Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do not teach or suggest
25 all of the feature(s) recited in claim 26. As described above in response to the

1 rejections of claims 1 and 2, Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do
2 not describe “submitting a request to a ticket issuing entity, the request containing
3 multiple user identities identifying multiple users of the game console, a game
4 title, and an identity of an online service”, as recited in claim 26.

5 Accordingly, independent claim 26 along with dependent claims 27-31 are
6 allowable over the Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and Stallings combination,
7 and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

8
9 **Claim 32** recites a method for operating a game console, comprising:

10 submitting a request to a ticket issuing entity, the request containing
11 multiple user identities identifying multiple users of the game console and
12 an identity of the game console; and

13 receiving a single ticket from the ticket issuing entity that can be
14 used to authenticate the multiple user identities and the game console.

15 **Claim 33** recites “creating a request with multiple user identities of
16 multiple users who are playing on a game console”.

17
18 Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do not teach or suggest
19 all of the feature(s) recited in claims 32 and 33. As described above in response to
20 the rejections of claims 1 and 2, Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings
21 do not describe “submitting a request to a ticket issuing entity, the request
22 containing multiple user identities identifying multiple users of the game console
23 and an identity of the game console”, or “receiving a single ticket from the ticket
24 issuing entity that can be used to authenticate the multiple user identities and the
25

1 game console”, as recited in claim 32. Further, Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952,
2 and/or Stallings do not describe “creating a request with multiple user identities of
3 multiple users who are playing on a game console”, as recited in claim 33.

4 Accordingly, independent claims 32 and 33 along with dependent
5 claims 34-36 are allowable over the Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and
6 Stallings combination, and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

7
8 **Claim 37** recites a method comprising:

9 receiving a request from a game console, the request containing
10 multiple user identities of multiple users who are playing at the game
11 console, a game console identity, a game title identity, and an identity of a
12 third party;

13 generating a single ticket to be used to authenticate the multiple user
14 identities, the game console identity, and the game title identity to the third
15 party; and

16 returning the ticket to the game console.

17 Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do not teach or suggest
18 all of the feature(s) recited in claim 37. As described above in response to the
19 rejections of claims 1 and 2, Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do
20 not describe a request from a game console, “the request containing multiple user
21 identities of multiple users who are playing at the game console, a game console
22 identity, a game title identity, and an identity of a third party” and “generating a
23 single ticket to be used to authenticate the multiple user identities, the game
24 console identity, and the game title identity to the third party”, as recited in
25 claim 37.

1 Accordingly, independent claim 37 along with dependent claims 39-42 are
2 allowable over the Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and Stallings combination,
3 and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

4
5 **Claims 67-68** recite “a single gaming ticket data structure embodied on a
6 computer readable media, comprising multiple user identities of users playing at a
7 game console, encrypted using a key associated with a third party entity to which
8 the multiple users are to be authenticated” (claim 67), and “a single gaming ticket
9 data structure embodied on a computer readable media, comprising multiple user
10 identities of users playing at a game console and an identity of the game console,
11 encrypted using a key associated with a third party entity to which the multiple
12 users are to be authenticated” (claim 68).

13 Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do not teach or suggest
14 all of the feature(s) recited in claims 67 and 68. As described above in response to
15 the rejections of claims 1 and 2, Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings
16 do not describe “a single gaming ticket data structure embodied on a computer
17 readable media, comprising multiple user identities of users playing at a game
18 console”, as recited in claims 67 and 68.

19 Accordingly, independent claims 67 and 68, along with dependent
20 claim 71, are allowable over the Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and Stallings
21 combination, and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

1 **Claims 72-73** recite in part a system comprising “a game console
2 configured to submit a request to the ticket issuing entity, the request containing
3 multiple user identities identifying multiple users of the game console, a game
4 console identity, a game title identity”, and “the ticket issuing entity being
5 configured to generate a single ticket that can be used by the game console to
6 authenticate the multiple user identities, the game console identity, and the game
7 title identity”.

8 Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings do not teach or suggest
9 all of the feature(s) recited in claims 72 and 73. As described above in response to
10 the rejections of claims 1 and 2, Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and/or Stallings
11 do not describe “a game console configured to submit a request to the ticket
12 issuing entity, the request containing multiple user identities identifying multiple
13 users of the game console, a game console identity, a game title identity”, or “the
14 ticket issuing entity being configured to generate a single ticket that can be used
15 by the game console to authenticate the multiple user identities, the game console
16 identity, and the game title identity”, as recited in claims 72 and 73.

17 Accordingly, independent claims 72 and 73 are allowable over the
18 Walker '609, Carter, Walker '952, and Stallings combination, and the §103
19 rejection should be withdrawn.

20
21 **Claims 45-58** are rejected over Walker '609 in view of Rackman, Stallings,
22 and Carter as described above. The Office cites to Rackman for the use of a serial
23 number to identify a game console (*Office Action* p.14). Rackman describes a
24 system for limiting the number of different video game machines on which a
25

1 cartridge may be played so as to effectively inhibit the conduct of a cartridge
2 rental business (Rackman *Abstract*). However, Rackman fails to teach or suggest
3 authenticating multiple users of the game console in a single request/reply
4 exchange.

5
6 **Claim 45** recites “constructing a game console with associated
7 authentication information”, and “storing the authentication information in a
8 database to be used for authenticating the game console, a game title executing on
9 the game console, and multiple users of the game console after the game console
10 is released from manufacturing.”

11 As described above in response to the rejections of claims 1 and 2,
12 Walker '609, Carter, and/or Stallings do not teach or suggest authenticating
13 multiple users of a game console as well as the game console and a game title.
14 Rackman fails to remedy these deficiencies of Walker '609, Carter, and Stallings.
15 As such, the Walker '609, Rackman, Stallings, and Carter combination does not
16 describe authentication information “for authenticating the game console, a game
17 title executing on the game console, and multiple users of the game console”, as
18 recited in claim 45.

19 Accordingly, independent claim 45 along with dependent claims 46-51 are
20 allowable over the Walker '609, Rackman, Stallings, and Carter combination, and
21 the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

1 **Claim 52** recites a method for validating an authenticity of a game console
2 and multiple users of the game console comprising “receiving, from the game
3 console, authentication information that is associated with the game console at a
4 time of manufacturing”, and “evaluating the authentication information to
5 determine whether the game console is valid”.

6 As described above in response to the rejection of claim 45, Walker '609,
7 Rackman, Stallings, and/or Carter do not teach or suggest “validating an
8 authenticity of a game console and multiple users of the game console”, as recited
9 in claim 52. Accordingly, claim 52 along with dependent claims 53-58 are
10 allowable over the Walker '609, Rackman, Stallings, and Carter combination, and
11 the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

12
13 **Conclusion**

14 Pending claims 1-37, 39-42, 45-58, 67-69, and 71-73 are in condition for
15 allowance and Applicant requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject
16 application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the
17 Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent
18 Action.

19 Respectfully Submitted,

20
21 Dated: May 5, 2006

22 By: _____

23 David A. Morasch
24 Lee & Hayes, PLLC
25 Reg. No. 42,905
 (509) 324-9256 x 210